****

**Assessment Committee May 16, 2022**

**NOTES**

Attended: Ashley Sears, Lisa Reynolds, Jason Kovac, Russel Pasewald, Shalee Hodgson, Dave Mount, Elizabeth Carney

Agenda:

1. Update: Gen ed Subcommittee
2. Meeting Schedule for Fall Term
3. Follow-up: Plan for reporting and report-feedback next year (look at PCC stuff)
4. Fall term work plan

Update: Gen ed Subcommittee

We talked about the subcommittee discussion about related instruction. [Notes are here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/17qU5lI1riguM5sVC56KYx7BP-1aZQ2vnxwCLSm10YfU/edit?usp=sharing).

Meeting Schedule for Fall term

Those present agreed that every other Monday at noon would still be a good time in the Fall.

Follow-up: Plan for reporting and report-feedback next year (look at PCC stuff)

**Extending/changing the report schedule to allow time for learning improvement:**

PCC report schedule: what would that mean for multiple outcomes? Would programs spend three years on one outcome? Would this mean that programs would not have time to assess all PLOs within the five year cycle of program review?

Maybe programs could be at different places with each outcome--assessing one, improving another, re-assessing another

PCC’s June deadline - this might set them up better for Fall?

In English, we have our first closing-the-loop discussion at the last dept meeting of term in Spring. The only time change is going to happen is between spring and fall, so there needs to be some kind of intention in place at the end of the academic year.

Probably worth revisiting the timeline - maybe with either a survey or through the already planned CQI review/improvement next year (review of continuous quality improvement cycle -- academic assessment, service area assessment, unit planning, program review, and budget process)

.

PCC integration year solves that problem of when to plan improvement in spring/fall

**Committee evaluation of program reports/plans:**

Would the committee review be required or voluntary for programs?

Could invite a number of programs each year to meet with the committee to share what has worked well for them and what has been challenging. Way for teams to highlight their good work and for the committee to get a deeper view of assessment. Perhaps choose programs that are close to their program review year.

Could provide us with examples of good practice

Having a rubric be part of our culture could be helpful

Eventually we could recruit faculty who have been through review to review others

A review should feel like it’s coming from faculty, not admin - admin can be part of it--but we should build out documentation to make sure that the faculty peer focus is central.

As an administrator, it would be helpful for me to get that chance to review reports and plans more carefully.

Yes would help me (admin) to better support programs

Important to show that admin value the assessment process

Yes, help us get beyond the approach of just “did you do it or not”? We’ve heard comments from faculty that some administrators don’t seem to care about assessment unless programs don’t do it.

Let’s be cautious about the vibe if we use a rubric. We don’t want it to swing toward punitive

The ideal would be a sense that together we are helping students learn

Would be helpful to hear from deans about the value of assessment from their perspective--providing the context of the larger picture, accreditation etc.

Goal: collaborative mentoring

What would the steps be for building a committee review process? Could include: Engagement with larger community, build rubric, pilot with a program or two. Could take a couple/three terms to prepare before actually beginning the review.

Keep in mind that if we do a new report process (a la PCC or other) it would mean we are building a process (committee evaluation) to review a new process (new report expectations/timeline). Two big changes at once.

Recruit more folks to the assessment committee. What would we want as representative areas in order to do the work effectively?

**Committee Work for Fall 2022:**

Year Seven accreditation report review/feedback; final draft should be done by end of December 2022

Plan an engagement strategy for the accreditation site visit in April 2023: communicating with faculty and staff about what the visit entails, what our Year Seven report says, what we hope to communicate to the visiting team, etc.

Research and explore possibilities for a more learning-improvement-focused reporting system, perhaps similar to PCC’s. We’re not yet sure if/how this could work; for example, how would a different reporting schedule fit in relation to the current 5-year cycle for assessment of a set of PLOs and the five-year program review cycle? We should communicate with the group currently doing a review/potential improvement of the college’s Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process (CQI is academic assessment, service area assessment, unit planning, program review, and budget process--and how all of these relate--or should relate). Jason Kovac, Katrina Boone, Ashley Sears, Jeff Shaffer, and Elizabeth Carney are the folks on that CQI team.

Plan for a potential committee report review process. There seems to be interest in doing this, with cautions about making sure we do it in a way that maintains and promotes the culture of assessment we want and in a way that is manageable and sustainable. What steps would be involved in planning, preparing, engaging whoever needs to be engaged? Which steps could happen AY 22-23 and which should wait for after accreditation?